



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

lation ; but used them as they were popularly understood, and desired to concentrate his own and his hearers' attention wholly on what was the true object of his teaching—the gospel of the Kingdom of God.”

Roman Reckoning of the Day. Upon this subject Profs. Dods and Sanday have had some little argument. Prof. Dods maintains that the Romans reckoned the day from sunrise to sunset, which would make noon the sixth hour. This he supports from the ancient Roman sun-dials, on which noon was marked VI ; and by the epigram of Martial (4:8) concerning the routine of the Roman day. He argues that this method of reckoning may fitly be called Roman, as opposed to the modern custom of reckoning from midnight, and because that which was Roman was likely to be “almost universal” at that time. Prof. Sanday objects to calling this method of reckoning “Roman,” first, because it was used by many other peoples as well ; second, because the Romans had another peculiar and exceptional method of reckoning from midnight, confined to certain legal and technical purposes, which should fitly be termed “Roman” rather than the other, if the designation is to be used.

The Messianic Consciousness of Jesus. Prof. Dickson thus presents the view of this taken by Dr. Wendt in his recent important work : “Wendt has no sympathy with the view that accounts for this reserve either by a gradual growth of the Messianic consciousness after the ministry began, or by a tentative process of laying claim to the character ; on the contrary, it was ever since the baptism a matter of personal experience and an undoubted certainty.” “He had early learned from his own experience what the true nature of the kingdom was, had set an example whereby others might learn how to realize it, and he had in this consciousness the sure basis of the certainty that he was the Messiah. Though he only avowed it towards the close, he was conscious of it from the baptism at the Jordan ; and it was the consciousness of his personal communion with God that assured him of his ability and vocation to undertake his Messianic work for others.” “This open avowal of his Messiahship was repressed, partly to obviate the risk of its being misconstrued by the prevalent expectations of the Jews, but mainly that he might first pave the way for its recognition in the right sense and on the true grounds by instruction as to the nature and aims of the kingdom. The Messiah was to be a means to an end ; though in reality the means precedes the end to which it ministers, in the matter of recognition the understanding of the end must precede the understanding of the means whereby it is appropriately to be attained.”

Preaching to the Spirits in Prison. Is there a passage in the Bible more alluring to exegetes than this one (1 Pet. 3 : 18–22) ? A writer in the *Homiletic Review* is the latest to discuss its meaning. Three criteria are established for the interpretation of the text : (1) it must conform to the exact language of the passage ; (2) also to the manifest teachings of plain portions of the same writing ; (3) also to the line of thought in the preceding and succeeding contexts. He finds this line of thought, which runs through the disputed text, to be Peter's exhortation to the Christians to live righteous lives, even at the cost of suffering therefor, as Christ had set them the example (vs. 18). The

Revised Version of the last half of the verse is commended, as bringing out the true sense, the contrast between Christ's physical nature on the one hand, and his spiritual nature on the other, the former of which was terminated by his death, while the latter was quickened into intensified life. The meaning of the passage referring to the preaching to the spirits in prison (vs. 19) must be in line with this thought, therefore ; and advances the argument by attesting the vigorous life and activity of Christ subsequent to his physical death. Two things the writer pronounces plain : (1) that the *unembodied* spirit of Christ preached ; (2) that those to whom he preached were antediluvian sinners. But the question arises, When was this preaching done ? He goes contrary to the commonly received theory that it was in the time between the crucifixion and the resurrection, and upon what he understands to be an exact reading of vs. 20, says it " would seem to indicate that the preaching was in the days of Noah and that the disobedience consisted in rejecting it ; " " that when their bodies perished in the flood, their spirits were put in safe keeping till the judgment." But how would such an interpretation advance, or even maintain, the line of argument which the writer defends in the passage, since it would make Christ's activity come before his physical death instead of subsequent to it ? There are other ways also in which it fails to be a satisfactory exegesis.